UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,959	04/26/2002	Yong-Seok Jeong	.08015.0006	6058
22852 7590 05/07/2007 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP	EXAMINER			
	MUSSELMAN, TIMOTHY A			
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3714		
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

·	•	$\bigvee$
·	Application No.	Applicant(s) 0 0 0 0 0
Office Action Surrence	10/018,959	JEONG, YONG-SEOK
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Timothy Musselman	3714
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap eriod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a red d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AB	CATION.  Poply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
tatus		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/10	<u>0/2006</u> .	
	is action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
isposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application	<b>n</b> .	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are rejected.	•	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.	
pplication Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ction is required if the drawing(	s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 H.S.C. &	119(a)-(d) or (f)
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	p. 1511. g under 55 5.0.5. g	
1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documen	nts have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority documen		pplication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price		
application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the certified copies not	received.
tachment(s)		
ttachment(s)  X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)
_	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date Iformal Patent Application

# DETAILED ACTION

#### Status of Claims

In response to the correspondence filed on 7/10/2006, claims 1-37 are pending.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the relevant portion of 35 U.S.C. 102 that forms the basis for the rejections made in this section of the office action;

(e) the invention was described in — (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, and 25-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Galdes et al. (6,177,932).

[1] Regarding claims 1,9,17,25-31, 34, and 37, Galdes discloses a method and apparatus for providing information to a user through a network connected system. See col. 1: 54-67 and fig. 1. Galdes further discloses wherein the system is executed on a storage device coupled to a processor [Claims 28-30]. See col. 2: 47-54. Galdes further discloses receiving a query from a user and generating a corresponding identification code [Claims 1,9,17,25-31, 34, 37]. See col. 4: 54-64, and note that the opened *case* is analogous to an identification code as applicant claims, because it is contains the details of the users help query (i.e. the case information generated and sent to the system *corresponds* to the query). Galdes further discloses wherein the query is sent and the identification code is generated by the user selecting a link on at least one web page [Claims 31 and 34]. See col. 4: 41-64. Galdes further discloses wherein said query is received from said user by a service-providing server and an identification code is generated

Art Unit: 3714

at said service/contents providing server corresponding with said query [Claims 17, 27, and 30-31, 34]. See col. 4: 54-56 and col. 3: 4-35. Galdes further discloses transmitting said identification code to a counseling server, where said counseling server determines a counselor using said identification code [Claims 1,9,17,25-31, 34-37]. See col. 4: 54-64 and col. 3: 30-35. Galdes further discloses creating a counseling chat room in which said user and said counselor are able to engage in interactive counseling [Claims 1,9,17,25-31, 34-37]. See col. 8: 51 – col. 9: 3. Galdes further discloses wherein said identification code includes at least query contents identification (aka category information as per claims 32 and 34) [Claims 1,9,17,25-30, 32-34]. See col. 4: 54-64.

- [2] Regarding claims 7, 15, and 23, Galdes further discloses wherein said counseling room is a cyber space in which said user and said counselor are able to engage in interactive counseling by using said query and said identification code in real time. See col. 3: 24-29 and col. 4: 54-64.
- [3] Regarding claims 3, 11, and 19, Galdes further discloses wherein the identification code includes the service-providing server's information as a domain name (URL). See col. 6: 23-29. Note that since the web-tracks (i.e. URL's) are used up to the point of submitting the query, the web-tracks would thus include the page on which the query was submitted, because the user *must* access that page *prior to* submitting the query.
- [4] Regarding claims 5, 13, and 21, Galdes further discloses wherein a user's location information is a user's connection control information. See col. 3: 36-47.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of the relevant portion of 35 U.S.C. 103 that forms the basis for the rejections made in this section of the office action;

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or

Application/Control Number: 10/018,959

Art Unit: 3714

described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galdes et al. (US 6,177,932) in view of Szlam et al. (US 5,594,791).

[5] Regarding claims 2, 10, and 18, Galdes discloses wherein the identification contains any information that improves the interaction between the customer and the system (col. 4: 54-64), but fails to teach wherein the identification explicitly includes language information. However, Szlam discloses a method and system for matching customers seeking help with appropriate agents, wherein language is a factor in matching the best agent. See col. 7: 26-44. In light of this teaching of Szlam, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize language as a parameter in the identification code of Galdes, so as to allow for effective communication between the parties. Additionally, note that since the language would be chosen in the query process, the correspondence of the language to the query would be automatic.

[6] Regarding claims 4, 12, and 20, Galdes further discloses wherein said query-contents identification is a category that said query belongs to among a plurality of query contents categories. See col. 5: 54-61. Note that searching through a tree (for the query) implies multiple categories. Galdes fails to teach wherein the categories are labeled with numbers. However, Szlam teaches of using numbers to categorize items. See col. 15: 37-41. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the numeric categorization of Szlam in the system of Galdes, in order to provide simple category designators.

[7] Regarding claims 6, 14, and 22, Galdes further discloses wherein said step of determining a counselor using said identification code is the step of determining a counselor using the query-contents

Art Unit: 3714

identification, but fails to teach wherein said identification includes language information. However, this is an obvious variation of Galdes in view of Szlam for the identical reasons and motivations set forth with respect to claims 2, 10, and 18 above.

[8] Regarding claims 8, 16, and 24, Galdes discloses wherein said counseling room is a chat room, where said chat room corresponds with said query. See col. 3: 24-29 and col. 4: 54-64. Galdes fails to teach of providing advertisement in the chat room. However, Szlam teaches of providing advertisements within a customer service setting. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the advertisements of Szlam into the system of Galdes, in order to provide additional revenue to recover operating costs.

## Pertinent Prior Art

Sullivan et al. (US 6,999,990) - networked based interactive customer service, wherein agent is selected based upon relevant skills.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to all claims have been fully considered, but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. This action is NON\_FINAL.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy Musselman whose telephone number is (571)272-1814. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 6:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto, can be reached at (571)272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/018,959 Page 6

Art Unit: 3714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TM

TM

ATHLEEN MOSSER PRIMARY EXAMINER